

## REMARKS

According to the present office action, claims 1-16 and claims 18-34 are pending in the application. Specifically, claims 1-2, 6, 8-15, 18-21, 23, 26, 28-29, and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious under U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135 (“Webb et al.”). Claims 3-5, 16, 22, 24-25, 27, and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious under Webb et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,367,628 (“Ote”). Finally, claim 7 was rejected under Webb et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,471 (“Brett”).

### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*

Claims 1 recites:

A computer system for running one or more software applications, wherein the software applications are suitable for generating a video output, the computer system comprising:

a host operating system suitable for displaying a graphical user interface;

*multiple guest operating systems running in virtual machines emulated by one or more emulator programs running on the host operating system; and*

wherein the host operating system is able to display *a reduced-size representation of the video output of at least one guest operating system* from the multiple guest operating systems that are being operated in a background mode.

(emphasis added). Applicant submits that none of the cited art, including Webb et al., teaches the above emphasized limitations.

In the office action, the examiner has stated:

[T]he host computer 11 can display multiple **printers** for the user to select one from the list of the available printers, which clearly means that each printer must have its own operating system to operate the printing function....

Office action, p. 2 (emphasis added). First, as a matter of terminology, printers do not have operating systems, but rather drivers or applets (or *maybe* applications, at most), but not entire (i.e. complex) operating systems, as this term is understood in the art. But, giving the term “operating system” the broadest possible interpretation (without ceding the propriety thereof), the examiner’s reasoning is as follows: since a host computer 11 can display multiple **printers** running their own “operating systems,” such a disclosure renders obvious a

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2118/304101.01  
**Application No.:** 09/617,669  
**Office Action Dated:** November 1, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

host operating system displaying multiple *virtual machines* running multiple guest operating systems. A *virtual* machine, which may be implemented in software, is not the same thing as a *physical* printer, which is a hardware device.

Secondly, if, as the examiner alleges, printers have operating systems, these operating systems do not run on the host computer 11 in Webb et al. (but instead on the printers themselves). Compare this with claim 1 that recites: “multiple guest operating systems running in virtual machines ... *running on the host operating system*” (emphasis added). Webb et al. does not disclose printer operating systems running on the host computer 11. Rather, all that Webb et al. discloses is the grabbing of graphical user interface (GUI) data from printers using publicly known application programming interfaces (APIs), in order to display such data (i.e. replicate it) on the host computer 11.

Claims 8, 11, 12, 21, 23, 30, and 33 recite similar subject matter to that of claim 1. Moreover, in so far as the dependent claims incorporate limitation from these independent claims, they also patentably define over the cited art. Thus, the applicant submits that all the pending claims, 1-16 and claims 18-34 define over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

Should the examiner have any questions or concerns, the undersigned can be contacted at 206-903-2461.

Date: February 1, 2008

/ Grzegorz S. Plichta /  
Grzegorz S. Plichta  
Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439